UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/850,318	05/07/2001	Keith S. Hamilton	MS 158537.1/40062.115US01	1703

23552 7590 08/24/2004

MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
LIEN, TAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/850,318	HAMILTON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tan Lien	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 May 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *07 May 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTIONS

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it has more than 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

Claims 1-21 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1, 7, 8, 16: The phrase "the identity" lacks antecedent basis. It is in claim 1, line 4, claim 7, line 4, claim 8, line 4, and claim 16, line 5. All other dependent claims are objected by virtue of their dependencies.

Claim 19: This claim is exactly, word for word, the same as claim 18. The "public" should be "private" on page 21, line 2 of claim 19 or else claim 21 is not limiting anything from claim 19.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al (US Patent 6,134,609) in view of Fox (US Patent 6,151,700).

Claim(s) 1, 8: Jones teaches a computer implemented method of activating a requested processing component initiated by a calling component within a local computing system having one or more applications, the method comprising:

determining the identity of the requested processing component, including an identity of a class ID from a request to activate a component initiated by a calling component (col. 5, lines 24-35; wherein the component is the object method identify in the hash);

obtaining configuration data for the requested component, the configuration data comprises an indication of public-private status for the requested component (col. 5, lines 30-32; wherein when the client is doing an RMI call to the remote server and the server is creating a remote object, the remote application server has to obtain the public status of the requested component in order for the server to create the object component); and

if the configuration data indicates that the requested component is a public component, activating an instance of the requested component (col. 5, lines 30-32; wherein when the client is doing an RMI call to the remote server and the server is creating a remote object, the remote application server has to obtain the

public status of the requested component in order for the server to create or making an instance of the object component);

Jones, however, fails to teach that if the configuration data indicates that the requested component is a private component, perform the following:

determining if the requested component is a member of an application that also includes the calling component as a member; and

if the requested component and the calling component are members of the same application, activating an instance of the requested component.

Fox, in an analogous art, teaches that if the method and data of an object are private, the method and data of that object can be accessed only by the other methods of that same object and not by the methods of other objects or other software programs. The concept of public and private access to methods and data of objects in object-oriented programming can be extended to public and private access to components of applications. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine and use Jones' method of invoking and identifying remote object methods with Fox's concept of public and private access to objects or components, for the advantages and benefits of encapsulation. Objects and components can be designed to hide or encapsulate the internal data structure and internal functions (col. 4, lines 17-22).

Claim(s) 2, 9: Jones and Fox teach the method according to claim 1, wherein the identity of the calling component corresponds to an identity obtained from a central directory service (FIG. 6 and col. 10, lines 30-38 Jones; wherein the central directory service is the mapping table built dynamically at run time on the server and the identity of the calling component is the hash value).

Claim(s) 3, 10: Jones and Fox teach the method according to claim 2, wherein the central directory service communicates with the local computer over a communication network (col. 2, lines 34-41 Jones).

Claim(s) 4, 11: Jones and Fox teach the method according to claim 1, wherein the calling component is located on a remote computing system (FIG. 3 Jones; wherein the client program is doing a RMI call to the remote server. The client is located on a remote computing system).

Claim(s) 5, 6, 12, 13: Jones and Fox teach the method according to claim 4, wherein the calling component transmit the request to activate a component to the local computing system across the Internet (FIG. 3 and col. 2, lines 34-41 Jones).

Claim(s) 7, 16-21: Jones teaches a computer implemented method of activating a requested processing component initiated by a calling component within a local computing system having one or more applications, the method comprising:

determining the identity of the requested processing component, including an identity of a class ID from a request to activate a component initiated by a calling component (col. 5, lines 24-35; wherein the component is the object method identify in the hash);

wherein the identity of the calling component corresponds to an identity obtained from a central directory service (FIG. 6 and col. 10, lines 30-38 Jones; wherein the central directory service is the mapping table built dynamically at run time on the server and the identity of the calling component is the hash value); and

the calling component is located on a remote computing system that transmits the request to activate a component to the local computing system across a communications network (FIG. 3 and col. 2, lines 34-41 Jones).

obtaining configuration data for the requested component, the configuration data comprises an indication of public-private status for the requested component (col. 5, lines 30-32; wherein when the client is doing an RMI call to the remote server and the server is creating a remote object, the remote application server has to

obtain the public status of the requested component in order for the server to create the object component); and

if the configuration data indicates that the requested component is a public component, activating an instance of the requested component (col. 5, lines 30-32; wherein when the client is doing an RMI call to the remote server and the server is creating a remote object, the remote application server has to obtain the public status of the requested component in order for the server to create or making an instance of the object component);

Jones, however, fails to teach that if the configuration data indicates that the requested component is a private component, perform the following:

determining if the requested component is a member of an application that also includes the calling component as a member; and

if the requested component and the calling component are members of the same application, activating an instance of the requested component.

Fox, in an analogous art, teaches that if the method and data of an object are private, the method and data of that object can be accessed only by the other methods of that same object and not by the methods of other objects or other software programs. The concept of public and private access to methods and data of objects in object-oriented programming can be extended to public and

private access to components of applications. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine and use Jones' method of invoking and identifying remote object methods with Fox's concept of public and private access to objects or components, for the advantages and benefits of encapsulation. Objects and components can be designed to hide or encapsulate the internal data structure and internal functions (col. 4, lines 17-22).

Claim(s) 14: Jones and Fox teach the computer data product according to claim 8, wherein

the computer data product comprises a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure a set of computer instructions (col. 7, lines 55-66 Jones).

Claim(s) 15: Jones and Fox teach the computer data product according to claim 8, wherein

the computer data product comprises a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave readable by a computing system and encoding a set of computer instructions (col. 7, lines 55-66 Jones).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tan Lien whose telephone number is (703) 305-6018. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30am to 6pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3718.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [tan.lien@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Tan Lien

Tan Lien tl

Paul H. Kang
PRIMARY EXAMINER